



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/479,999	01/10/2000	LEE EVEN NAKAMURA	A7631/ST9-97	3788

7590

03/24/2003

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W  
WASHINGTON, DC 200373202

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SD

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/479,999

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 and 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: request for reconsideration filed 1/9/03 of application filed on 01/10/00 which is a continuation of the application 08/892,842 filed on 7/11/97, now US Pat No. 6,178,433 B1.
2. Claims 7-12, 27-31 are pending in the case. Claims 7, 11 and 27 are the independent claims.
3. The double patenting rejections of claims 7-12, 27-31 have been withdrawn in view of the submission of the terminal disclaimer.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7-12, 27-31 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, *Using Netscape 2, Que Corporation*, pages 8-11, 163, 675-679, 779 in view of Benedikt et al. (US Pat No. 5,966,535, 10/12/99, filed 12/7/95).

Regarding independent claim 7, Brown discloses:

- generating a page of presentation material in response to a request for an information, wherein the page is generated based on the first information layout

Art Unit: 2178

and includes the first information and does not contain the second information (page 10, figure 1.4, when a user selects NFL from the list of items on the left side and, only the information about NFL is displayed on the right side of the page; the information of Cyberspace Showdown III or Raiders' Fan Wins Contest! are not shown; figure 7.15, in response to a request for an information, which is a link, on the list of people displayed on the left side, and only the resume of the selected person Doug Folsom is displayed on the right side, the resume of Carol Guttery is not shown on the right side)

Brown does not disclose defining in a single file a first variable and a second variable for a first information and a second information, and defining in a single file a presentation layout for each said information corresponding to the variables.

Benedikt discloses defining variables in the HTML code of a web document for different data (col 8, lines 27-44; col 11, lines 2-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Benedikt into Brown for defining variables for data in a web page and referring said variables to the activities related to said data because of the following reason. Brown shows the ability of displaying in response to a request for an information based on the first information layout and includes the first information and does not contain the second information, and Benedikt has the ability of defining variables in HTML tags. Since it was well known in the art that a HTML tag includes instructions that tell web browser *how to present a web document*, the fact that Brown has the ability of displaying the first information upon a request in the presentation

Art Unit: 2178

layout where the presentation layout does not contain the second information suggests that the tags in the HTML code of the web document include such variable definition as well as referring the variables to the corresponding presentation layout to obtain the result as disclosed in Brown. Also, *the list on the left side as disclosed is considered as the topic outline of the web page*, and the information displayed on the right side of the web page is based on the user's selection from said list (page 163, figure 7.15). This suggests that all data selected from the list be included in a single file.

Regarding claims 8 and 10, which are dependent on claim 7, Brown discloses that said page is World Web page for displaying on the web browser and the request, which is actually a hyperlink, includes a uniform resource locator URL (page 10, figure 1.4; page 163, figure 7.15).

Regarding claim 9, which are dependent on claim 7, Brown discloses that the web browser does not support a hypertext markup language frame tag (page 10, figure 1.4; page 779, apply NOFRAMES for no frames-capable browsers).

Claims 11-12 are for a system of method claims 7-10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 27-31 are for a system of method claims 7-10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 1/9/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claim 7, Applicants argue that both figure 1.4 and figure 7.15 of Brown do not disclose "generating a page of presentation material in response to a request for said first information, wherein the page is generated based on the first presentation layout and includes said first information and does not contain said second information" (Remarks, page 2).

Examiner agrees that the two figures of Brown do not explicitly disclose generating a page. However, figure 1.4 and figure 7.15 of Brown display a list of items, and in response to a user's selection, only the content of the selected item is displayed. That means the currently displayed page includes the first information (the selected one) and does not include the second information.

The display of the web pages as seen in the figures inherently teaches that a web page with such a defined layout is already generated. Otherwise, the web page can not be displayed as seen in the figures.

Applicants also argue that figure 1.4 of Brown does not disclose that the NFL selection from the list of items on the left side of the page causes only information related to the NFL to be displayed on the right side of the page. Applicants further argue that since all the information on this web page – according to Applicants it is the NFL's home page

Art Unit: 2178

based on the page's URL -- is apparently related to the National Football League (NFL), to see further detailed information of the topics, one simply has to scroll down the display.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As seen on the left side of the page of figure 1.4, it is easy to recognize that there are some hyperlinks for different things such as Cyberspace Showdown III, Jim Kelly vs. Drew Blodsoe, Tuesday, Nov.21, 9 pm ET, Raiders' Fan Wins Contest!, and the anchor This Week in the NFL. On the right side of the page is the display of the NFL homepage. As such, based on the selection of the NFL anchor on the left side, the NFL home page is displayed on the right side. The page's URL is of the currently displayed page on the right side, not the main page that include all the information including the hyperlinks mentioned above.

Accordingly, by scrolling down the display, more information about the NFL is displayed. The information about Cyberspace Showdown III or Raiders' Fan Wins Contest is not displayed.

Applicants argue that it is possible to use hyperlinks to link to additional information on *the same page* and by scrolling down the display, the information about Cyperspace Showdown III or Raiders' Fan Wins Contest! will be displayed.

Examiner agrees that it is possible to use hyperlinks to link to additional information on the same page. However, the hyperlinks on figure 1.4 *can not be the internal links*.

According to the order, the Cyberspace Showdown III and Raiders' Fan Wins Contest! are above the "This Week in the NFL." Therefore, the additional information contained in Cyberspace Showdown III and Raiders' Fan Wins Contest! can not be seen further down the page from the current display of the NFL section. Furthermore, if all of the hyperlinks on left side are internal hyperlinks as argued and the web page displayed on the right side includes the contents of all of the hyperlinks on the left side, then the scroll bar should be longer to show the size of the page up to the currently displayed section, which is the NFL, since the page on the right side should include all the contents of the hyperlinks above the "This Week in the NFL." On the other hand, the scroll bar as seen shows that information displayed on the right side is about half of the whole document. Therefore, the scroll bar does not show the size of the main page that includes the contents of all of the internal hyperlinks on the left side. Instead, the scroll bar shows the size of the NFL page only, which is currently displayed on the right pane, in response to the selection of the link "This week in the NFL." In other words, the display on the right side includes only the content of the selected item, which is equivalent to the first information, and does not contain the content of the non selected item, which is the second information.

Applicants argue that figure 7.15 of Brown illustrates a framed web page and thus the page has various problems associated with the frame-based approach such as requiring a frame-capable web browser for displaying and each frame's information can be stored in a separate file. Applicants further disclose that figure 7.15 does not teach



or suggest generation of a web page, as contrasted with the mere presentation of a web page (or frame).

Examiner agrees that figure 7.15 is a framed web page that needs a frame-capable browser to be displayed. However, Brown does provide the NOFRAMES tag (page 779) so that *browsers without frames capability can read and display a framed web page*. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have included the NOFRAMES tag into the HTML code of the web page so that a framed web page would not be a problem to the web browsers without frames capability anymore.

As seen in figure 7.15, each frame's information is not stored in a separate file. Brown teaches "a program that makes the resumes of list of people available might have two panes: one to display a list of people and another to display the resume of the currently selected person" and "Figure 7.15 shows a web page that does the same thing as the resume program. It has three frames: one that shows a list of people, another for the resume of the currently selected individual, and a pane at the bottom to select a category" (page 163). Since the program is for displaying the resumes of a list of people available for recruiting, the resumes and the list of people should be stored in a single file of the recruiting service.

Since the figure 7.15 shows the display of a page where the presentation of the page on the right pane is in response to a user selection of one of the hyperlinks on the left pane, figure 7.15 inherently shows generating a page with such a specific layout for

Art Unit: 2178

including the first information and does not contain the second information is performed.

Otherwise, there is no such a page for displaying.

Applicants argue that Benedikt, in combination with Brown, does not disclose “defining, in a first portion of the single file, a first variable equal to first information and a second variable equal to second information” and “defining, in a second portion of the single file, first and second presentation layouts, wherein said first presentation layout includes said first variable and said second presentation layout includes said second variable” (Remarks, page 5).

Examiner agrees that Benedikt does not disclose the argued limitations.

However, Benedikt discloses defining variables in the HTML code of a web document for different data (col 8, lines 27-44; col 11, lines 2-15). The variable feature in Benedikt is to show that each data can have an associated variable defined for specifying the particular data. Brown inherently shows generating of a page of presentation material in response to a request for said first information, wherein the page is generated based on the first presentation layout and includes said first information and does not contain said second information. The variable feature of Benedikt, therefore, can be associated with different information of Brown for specifying various data in performing different functions in a specific programming method.

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schumacher et al. (US Pat No. 5,933,841, 8/3/99, filed 5/17/96).

Schumacher et al. (US Pat No. 6,442,574 B1, 8/27/02, filed 4/29/99, priority 5/17/96).

Douglis et al. (US Pat No. 6,021,426, 2/1/00, filed 12/1/97).

Marcos et al. (US Pat No. 6,429,880 B2, 8/6/02, filed 4/25/01, priority 4/14/97).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 707-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9000.

clh  
3/19/03

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100